
CHAPTER 2 – AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT, ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES, AND AVOIDANCE, MINIMIZATION, AND/OR MITIGATION MEASURES



Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences, and Avoidance, Minimization, and/or Mitigation Measures

2.1 ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES WITH NO ADVERSE IMPACTS

As part of the scoping and environmental analysis conducted for the Project, the following environmental issues were considered but no adverse impacts were identified. Consequently, there is no further discussion regarding these issues in the document.

2.1.1 Human Environment

2.1.1.1 Land Use

The Project is consistent with applicable transportation plans and programs, regional growth plans, general and community plans (including the Estuary Policy Plan), and specific development proposals. No impacts are anticipated with regard to land use.

The Project is not located within State coastal jurisdiction or within any coastal zone management program.¹ Therefore, the Project would have no impacts on a coastal zone.

The Project is not located near a wild and scenic river.² Therefore, the Project would have no impacts on a wild and scenic river.

2.1.1.2 Growth

The Project area is a developed urban area with little development potential due to low land availability.

The Project would not encourage growth beyond that envisioned in ABAG's growth projections, and the proposed interchange improvements would be consistent with applicable regional growth plans.

Project-related growth is not considered to be "reasonably foreseeable" because the Project has been designed to accommodate present and projected increases in traffic volumes, expected as a result of previously implemented and planned development in the area. In addition, the Project is necessary to improve the safety of both the mainline I-880 as well as the northbound ramps at 29th and 23rd Avenues. As a result, there are no anticipated impacts to growth, and no avoidance, minimization, and/or mitigation measures are required for the Project.

2.1.1.3 Farmlands/Timberlands

There are no farmlands or timberlands within the Project area.³ Therefore, the Project would have no impacts on farmlands or timberlands.

¹ <http://coastalmanagement.noaa.gov/mystate/ca.html>

² <http://www.rivers.gov/wildriverslist.html>

2.1.1.4 Community Character

Environmental Justice

The Jingletown community is a community that meets the criteria for potential environmental justice impacts. There is an elevated level of minority and low-income populations within the study area. However, it is not anticipated that the Proposed Project would result in disproportionately high or adverse impacts to these populations. On the contrary, the Project addresses existing problems within the vicinity of the community and would result in beneficial impacts to the community as a result of the proposed freeway improvements, including increased quality of life due to reduced noise impacts and increased pedestrian and cyclist safety, particularly in the vicinity of the Lazear Elementary School. The Proposed Project would not result in any displacements, and therefore, would not divide a minority population or impact the economic vitality of these populations. No minority or low-income populations have been identified that would be adversely affected by the Proposed Project. Therefore, this Project is not subject to the provisions of Executive Order 12898.

2.1.2 Physical Environment

2.1.2.1 Hydrology and Floodplain

A review of the Flood Boundary and Floodway Map from the National Flood Insurance Program administered by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) indicates that the Project study area is not located within either a 100-year or 500-year floodplain.⁴ Therefore, the Project would have no impacts on hydrology and floodplains.

2.1.2.2 Paleontology

There is a low sensitivity for paleontological resources within the Project area.⁵ Therefore, the Project would have no impacts on paleontological resources.

2.1.3 Biological Environment

2.1.3.1 Natural Communities

There are no known natural communities of special concern within or in close proximity to the study area. The Project would have no effect on natural communities of special concern.

2.1.3.2 Wetlands and Other Waters

There are no jurisdictional waters of the United States present in the Project area.⁶ Therefore, the Project would have no impacts on wetlands or other waters.

³ <http://www.conservation.ca.gov/dlrp/lca/Pages/Index.aspx>

⁴ [msc.fema.gov/](http://www.msc.fema.gov/)

⁵ ICF Jones and Stokes, *Archaeological Survey Report*, April 2009.

⁶ RBF Consulting, *Natural Environment Study – Minimal Impacts*, October 2008.

2.1.3.3 Threatened and Endangered Species

No suitable habitat for any of the eight threatened/endangered plant species was present in the study area; no special status species were identified. Based on this, the botanist determined that there are no threatened or endangered plant species in the study area. None of the 23 threatened or endangered wildlife species identified would occur in the study area because it either lacks suitable habitat for the species or the Project is outside the species' known range.⁷

2.1.3.4 Invasive Species

Fourteen noxious weed species were documented in the Project study area. However, there are no native plant communities in the Project area that could be affected by the dispersal of noxious weeds. Therefore, the Project would have no impacts related to invasive species.⁸

⁷ RBF Consulting, Natural Environment Study – Minimal Impacts, October 2008.

⁸ RBF Consulting, Natural Environment Study – Minimal Impacts, October 2008.

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK.